



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

agencies. The average seminary makes no provision worth mentioning for courses corresponding to diagnosis, or physiology, or hygiene, or clinical practice. A medical school without these courses would be condemned by the law of the state.

Thirdly: Not more than one dozen seminaries have anything like an adequate curriculum in the matter of sociology. . . . While I am myself a conservative in theology, I am frank to say that the professors and students who seem to be most effective in their approach to the people in their most difficult social problems are those in the seminaries that teach the so-called modern theological view.

Fourthly: Many of the seminaries say they would like to give more work in sociology, but they say they haven't the money. It is quite evident that there

are too many poorly equipped seminaries in the country.

Fifthly: Comparatively few seminaries have courses in the social teaching of the Bible. In many of the seminaries the students are asking for added courses in sociology.

Conditions in the theological seminaries are in fact changing. Wide-awake students coming from the college classroom where sociology is one of the most important subjects demand that this subject be studied in the seminary. Almost every leading seminary has thus been forced to adapt its courses of study to meet the newer conception of the functions of the church in human society.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BOOK OF GENESIS

PROFESSOR LEWIS BAYLES PATON, PH.D, D.D.
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut

XII. The Conquest of Canaan

In the preceding article¹ attention was called to the facts that the Egyptian monuments seem to show that some Hebrews were settled in Canaan as early as the Eighteenth Dynasty, while other Hebrews were living in Egypt as late as the Nineteenth or the Twentieth Dynasty; that one tradition in the Old Testament makes the exodus occur as early as 1500 B.C., while another tradition places it as late as 1200 B.C., and still

other traditions hold that only part of the tribes of Israel were in Egypt; that the Pentateuchal documents are unable to combine the stay of the tribes at Kadesh with the stay at Sinai, which seems to show that part of the tribes rallied around Kadesh before their invasion of Canaan and another part around Sinai, and that these two stays were not connected. We must now examine the narratives of the conquest, and we shall find

¹ *Biblical World*, August, 1915, pp. 82-89.

that they point in the same direction as these other facts, namely that the Hebrews invaded Canaan in two divisions at two separate times.

I. The Narratives of the Conquest

A. The Narratives of the Conquests in the Book of Numbers

In Num., chaps. 13 f, J, E, and P narrate how Moses sent spies into Canaan from Kadesh-Barnea on the southern frontier, how their report so terrified the Hebrews that they refused to invade the land, and how they were sentenced to die in the desert. In Num. 14:40-45 (J) we read how, in spite of Moses' prohibition, they invaded Southern Canaan, and were defeated by the Amalekites and Canaanites, and pursued as far as Hormah. The story is repeated in Deut. 1:41-44.

Num. 21:1-3 (J) is evidently the continuation of J's account of the defeat at Hormah in Num. 14:45. Vs. 1 states that some Israelites were taken prisoners by the Canaanites; vs. 2, that Israel vowed to devote the Canaanite cities to destruction; and vs. 3, that they captured them, destroyed them, and called the region Hormah. The two narratives join on naturally to one another, and the mention of Hormah in both shows that they form a connected series of events. The episode is repeated in Judg. 1:17, but here we are told more precisely that the "Israel" that captured the city was the two Leah tribes Judah and Simeon. Here is a narrative of the conquest in which the tribes are not united as in the Book of Joshua, but part of them, namely the Leah tribes Judah and Simeon (cf. Judg. 1:17), invade Canaan from the south, leaving the others to invade the land from the east. Here nothing is said

about Joshua as a leader, and the conquest is evidently very incomplete. Apparently we have here a memory of an earlier settlement in Canaan than that under Joshua.

B. The First Chapter of Judges

In Judg. 1:1a, we read: "And it came to pass after the death of Joshua," but this clause is certainly an editorial addition (cf. Exod. 1:1; Lev. 1:1; Num. 1:1; I Sam. 1:1; I Kings 1:1, all of which begin with an "and," designed to link the law and the former prophets in a consecutive narrative). The death of Joshua is not narrated by Judges until 2:8, and the events recorded in Judg., chap. 1, do not follow the death of Joshua. When in vss. 1b-2 the children of Israel inquire, "Who shall go up first to fight against the Canaanites?" and Yahweh replies, "Judah shall go up first," this is evidently the beginning of the invasion of Canaan, not an expedition by Judah after the united tribes have conquered the land. Judg., chap. 1, is an independent account of the conquest of Canaan that is parallel to the Book of Joshua. It represents an early form of the J tradition.

In vss. 1-20 we are told that the tribes of Judah and of Simeon were the first to invade Canaan. In vss. 16-17 we find a duplicate to the narrative in Num. 14:45; 21:1-3. It mentions an attack on the Amalekites and Canaanites in the south, as does Num. 14:45. The wilderness of 'Arad (vs. 16) lies just north of Hormah, around the modern Tell 'Arad. The invasion ends in the destruction of the Canaanite cities, and giving of the name Hormah, just as in Num. 21:3. The Kenites, Judah and

Simeon, make the attack in Judg. 1:16 f.; in Num. 21:1 ff. the general name Israel is used. In vs. 21 we are told how the tribe of Benjamin could not drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem. Then in vss. 22-26 we read how the tribes of Joseph invaded Canaan and captured Bethel; vss. 27-28, how the tribe of Manasseh failed to conquer the Canaanites completely; vss. 29-36, how the other tribes also failed to make complete conquests. This narrative in Judges differs from the narratives in Numbers in regarding the tribes as all united in the east of Canaan before the crossing of the Jordan, whereas Numbers declares that they were not united in any part of the conquest, some of them coming in from the south. In the invasion of the land west of the Jordan, Judg., chap. 1, agrees with Numbers that the tribes conquered their territories separately, or at most in pairs. Like Numbers, Judg., chap. 1, does not mention Joshua, but it mentions Caleb and Othniel as tribal leaders of Judah (vss. 20 f., 13 f.). It states expressly that the conquest was only partial, and that the fortified cities of the Canaanites could not be captured. It also states that the Canaanites were not destroyed, but that they dwelt in the midst of Israel (vss. 21, 27-36).

C. The JE Narratives in Joshua

It is now generally recognized that the Book of Joshua is composed out of the same four elements that we find in the Pentateuch, namely, J, E, D, and P. The sections assigned to J by Carpenter and Battersby, *The Hexateuch*, are as follows: 2:2-3ac, 4b-5a, 6, 8-9a, 12, 13b-14, 17, 18ac, 19-21; 3:1ac, 5, 9-10a, 11, 13, 17a; 4:3b, 6-7a, 8b, 10b-11, 18;

5:2, 3, 9, 13-15; 6:2, 3, 7a, 10-12a, 14, 15; 16b-17b, 20ac, 21, 25, 26; 7:2-26; 8:1a, 2b-8a, 9-11, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 29; 9:4, 5, 6b-7, 11b-14, 15b, 16bd, 22b-23, 26; 10:1ac, 2, 3, 5b-6ac, 7a, 9, 10b, 12-14, 16-24, 26, 27; 11:1, 4-9; 13:1, 7, 13; 15:14-19, 63; 16:1-3, 10; 17:11-18; 19:47. Those assigned to E are as follows: 1:1, 2, 10-11a; 2:1, 3b, 4a, 5b, 7, 13a, 15, 16, 18b, 22-24a; 3:1b, 2, 3, 6, 12, 14; 4:1b-3a, 4, 5, 20; 6:1, 4-6, 7b-9, 12b-13, 16a, 20b, 22-24; 8:12, 18, 24, 26; 9:3, 6a, 8-9a, 11a, 15a, 16ac, 22a; 10:1b, 4-5a, 6bd, 10a, 11; 24:1-12, 14-30, 32, 33.

The JE narratives in Joshua and the first chapter of Judges are so similar in their main features that they must be regarded as parallel accounts of the conquest. Judg. 1:1 assumes that the Hebrews were together before the invasion, evidently in the east of Canaan, since the first attack is directed against the king of Jerusalem (vss. 4-7), and the subsequent campaigns proceed first southward and then northward (vss. 1 ff., 22 ff.). With this corresponds Josh. 1-2. Judg. 1:16 makes Judah go up out of the City of Palms (Jericho; cf. 2:1a, 5b, where the angel of Yahweh goes up from Gilgal). With this corresponds the crossing of Jordan and the capture of Jericho (Josh. 3-6).

Judah and Simeon then fight with Adoni-Bezeq (Judg. 1:5), who seems to be the king of Jerusalem, because after his defeat and mutilation he returns to Jerusalem to die (vs. 7), and because he is powerful enough to have seventy kings gather their food under his table (vs. 7; cf. the position of the king of Jerusalem in the Amarna Letters). With this corresponds Joshua's expedition against Adoni-Şedeq, king of Jerusalem

(Josh., chap. 10). The parallelism of the narratives in all other details compels us to identify these campaigns; Adoni-Sedeq and Adoni-Bezeq seem to be merely textual variants. The various recensions of the Greek read Adoni-Bezeq in Joshua.

The campaign against Adoni-Bezeq (Sedeq) is followed in Judg. 1:8-21 by a southward movement of Judah and Simeon through which they gain the Highland of Judah and the Negeb. With this corresponds Joshua's conquest of the same regions (Josh., chap. 10). Judg. 1:22-36 describes the conquests of the northern tribes, proceeding from south to north. With this corresponds Joshua's victory over the northern coalition of Canaanites (Josh., chap. 11).

In the account of the distribution of the land (Josh., chaps. 13-18) a number of verses of Judg., chap. 1, are repeated verbatim. These parallel verses are as follows: Judg. 1:10, 20 = Josh. 15:13 f.; Judg. 1:11-13 = Josh. 15:15-17; Judg. 1:14-15 = Josh. 15:18-19; Judg. 1:21 = Josh. 15:63; Judg. 1:27-28 = Josh. 17:11-13; Judg. 1:29 = Josh. 16:10. A comparison of the two histories indicates, accordingly, that Joshua is only a variant and more elaborate version of the same conquest that is described in Judg., chap. 1.

The JE narratives in Joshua differ from the first chapter of Judges and from Numbers in stating that the twelve tribes entered Canaan together from the east, under the command of Joshua, and that he defeated the coalitions of Canaanite kings both in the south and in the north. The tribes remained united under Joshua until after the battle with

Jabin, king of Hazor, in Josh., chap. 11. After this JE agrees with Num. and with Judg., chap. 1, that the tribes divided and conquered their territories separately.

J and E agree also with Judg., chap. 1, that many cities were not conquered by the Israelites, e.g., Jerusalem (Josh. 12:1, 10; 15:63), Gezer (16:10), Taanach and Megiddo (17:11-18). J also says that several cities were taken by other persons than Joshua; e.g., Hebron by Caleb (15:13 f.), Debir by Othniel (15:15-17), the Highland of Israel by the tribe of Joseph (17:14-18). J and E also agree with Judg., chap. 1, that the Canaanites were not annihilated as D claims. In 13:1b, 13; 15:63; 16:10; 17:12 f.; Judg. 2:23; 3:5, J tells us that the Canaanites "dwell in the midst of Israel unto this day," and in the legislation of J (Exod. 34:11-13) it is assumed that they are still a menace. E also says of the Canaanites, "I will not drive them out before thee in one year, lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee; by little and little I will drive them out from before thee" (Exod. 23:29 f.; cf. Judg. 3:4, E).

D. The Narratives of the Sons of Jacob in Gen., Chaps. 29-49

In a previous article¹ it was shown that the stories of the sons of Jacob in Genesis do not refer to individuals but to incidents of tribal history from the time of the conquest onward. They may be used, therefore, to supplement the traditions of the conquest in Numbers, Joshua, and Judges. These narratives of the sons of Jacob agree with the JE narratives in Joshua in making the tribes invade Canaan together and remain to-

¹ *Biblical World*, July, 1915, pp. 31 f.

gether for a certain time, but afterward divide for the conquest of their individual territories. The JE narratives do not mention Joshua, and they assume that the conquest was incomplete and that the Canaanites were not exterminated. In general it may be said that the JE stories of the tribes of Israel in Genesis and the JE narratives in Joshua represent the same stage in the development of the tradition of the conquest.

E. Deuteronomic and Priestly Sections in Joshua

The passages assigned to the Deuteronomic editor by Carpenter and Battersby are: 1:3-9, 11b-18; 2:9b-11, 24b; 3:4b, 7, 10b, 17b; 4:1a, 9-10a, 12, 14, 21-24; 5:1, 4, 5, 6-8; 6:18, 27; 8:1b-2a, 8b, 27, 28, 30-35; 9:9b-10, 24, 25; 10:7b-8, 15, 25, 28-43; 11:2, 3, 10-23; 12:1-24; 13:2-6, 8-12, 14; 14:6-15; 21:43-45; 22:1-8; 23:1-16; 24:13, 31. The remaining passages not assigned to J, E, or D belong to the Priestly Code.

D and P agree with JE in Joshua that the tribes were united in the conquest of Canaan under the leadership of Joshua. They differ from JE and from Judg., chap. 1, in stating that Joshua conquered *all* the cities of the land (Josh. 10:28-43; 11:10-12, 23), and gave these cities to the tribes of Israel (Josh. 13-22.) Several cities they state expressly were conquered by Joshua which J and Judg., chap. 1, say were not conquered. Thus D in Josh. 12:1, 10 states that Jerusalem was captured by Joshua, but J in 15:63 and Judg. 1:21 state that it was not captured. D in 10:33 and 12:12 and P in 21:21 say that Gezer was taken, but J in 16:10 and Judg. 1:29 say that it was not

taken. D in 12:21 and P in 21:25 say that Taanach and Megiddo were taken, but J in 17:11-18 and Judg. 1:27 say that these cities were not taken. D and P also ascribe the capture of several cities to Joshua which J and Judg., chap. 1, ascribe to other men. Thus according to D in 10:36 f. and 11:21 Hebron was taken by Joshua, but according to J in 15:13 f. and Judg. 1:20 it was taken by Caleb. According to D in 10:38 f.; 11:21; 12:13 Debir was conquered by Joshua, but according to J in 15:15-17 and Judg. 1:11-13 it was conquered by Othniel. According to D in 11:1-20; 12:18-24 the northern highland was conquered by Joshua, but according to J in 17:14-18 it was conquered by the tribe of Joseph.

It appears, accordingly, that there is a great difference of opinion among our Hexateuchal documents in regard to the manner of the conquest of Canaan. The older ones point in the same direction as the archaeological evidence, namely that the Hebrew tribes entered Canaan at different times; the later ones affirm the unity of Israel under Joshua in the conquest.

II. Historical Conclusions in Regard to the Origin of Israel

Having now examined the evidence in regard to the sojourn in Egypt, the exodus, and the conquest of Canaan by the Hebrews, we are ready to raise the question: What are the historical facts that we can gather out of this mass of conflicting testimony? In general it may be said that the statements of the older Hexateuchal sources commend themselves as more trustworthy than those of the later sources.

A. JE in Joshua Is More Trustworthy than D and P

1. *The Canaanites were not exterminated.*—The older histories agree that the Canaanites were not exterminated, as D and P in Joshua record, but that they continued to dwell in the midst of Israel, as narrated in Judg., chap. 1, and J in Joshua (cf. Judg. 3:1-16; II Sam. 24:7; I Kings 9:20-21). The prohibitions of marriage with the Canaanites and of worship of their gods that continue down to Deuteronomy (Exod. 23:24, 32 f.; 34:11-13; Deut. 7:1-5, 22) show that the Canaanites lived among the Israelites long after the conquest. Only thus can we explain the Canaanizing of the religion of Israel that the prophets denounce.

2. *The Canaanite cities were not all captured by Joshua.*—The capture of the strongholds of Canaan by Joshua, according to D and P in Joshua, is unhistorical in comparison with the statements of Judg., chap. 1, and J in Joshua that the Israelites were unable to drive out the Canaanites. Jerusalem was not taken until the time of David (II Sam. 5:6-9; cf. Judg. 19:12; against Josh. 12:10). The Canaanites were not expelled from Gezer until the time of Solomon (I Kings 9:16; cf. Judg. 1:29; against Josh. 12:12). Beth-shan remained in the hands of the Philistines until the time of David (I Sam. 31:10; cf. Judg. 1:27). Taanach and Megiddo were still Canaanite in the time of Deborah (Judg. 5:19; cf. 1:27; against Josh. 12:21; 21:25). Shechem was still a Canaanite city in the time of Abimelech (Judg. 9:28; cf. Gen. 34:2).

This discrediting of the tradition of D and P in regard to the completeness of Joshua's conquest discredits also their statements in regard to the union of the

tribes under Joshua in the conquest of the land, and shows that JE in Joshua and Judg., chap. 1, are more historical in regarding the tribes as acting independently.

B. Judg., Chap. 1, Is More Trustworthy than JE in Joshua

Judg., chap. 1, knows of no union of the tribes after the crossing of the Jordan. JE in Joshua regards the tribes as united in two campaigns under Joshua but divided later. There is no trace in later history of such a union of the tribes as the documents in Joshua assume. In the Song of Deborah (Judg., chap. 5), Deborah, in the face of mortal danger, is able to get volunteers only from Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir, Zebulun, Issachar, and Naphtali, i.e., the northern tribes who were directly menaced by Sisera. Reuben, Gilead, Dan, and Asher will not come, and Judah, Simeon, and Levi are not even invited. Throughout the Book of Judges, apart from editorial passages, the Judges appear as tribal leaders only, and the tribes are often at war with one another (Judg. 3:27; 6:34 f.; 8:1; 9:6; 11:8; 12:4-6; 15:11 f.). David and Solomon by force of arms held the tribes together for a while, but after Solomon's death they immediately fell apart.

There is general agreement that Judg., chap. 1, and the identical verses in Josh. 15-17 contain the earliest form of J's account of the conquest, and that the J section in Josh., chaps. 1-11, which represent the tribes as united under the command of Joshua, form a secondary stratum in the J document that approximates to the standpoint of D. These sections show more legendary embellishment than is found in J's narrative in

Numbers of the conquests east of the Jordan, and it is probable, therefore, that they are of later origin.

C. Num. 15:44-45+21:1-3 Is More Trustworthy than Judg., Chap. 1

If Judah and Simeon conquered their territories independently, as Judg., chap. 1, relates, it is improbable that they were united with the other tribes as far as Gilgal. If such a union had existed, it would not have been dissolved on the border of Canaan, when the hardest fighting remained still to be done. The account of Numbers which makes part of Israel invade Canaan from Kadesh furnishes a much more natural introduction to the separate conquests by Judah, Simeon, Caleb, Othniel, and the Kenites in Judg., chap. 1, than does the present context in J. Sephath is only about forty miles distant from Kadesh. It is more probable that it was conquered directly from Kadesh, as Numbers relates, than by the circuitous route around the land of Edom, by way of Gilgal, Jericho, and Jerusalem, as Judg., chap. 1, assumes. In the time of David, Judah lived far north of Sephath. If Judg., chap. 1, is correct, we must suppose that this tribe conquered southward as far as Sephath; and then, for some unknown reason, returned to the north. If Numbers is correct, then the capture of Sephath was merely an incident in the northward movement of Judah from Kadesh to its later seat. The separation of Judah from the northern tribes down to the period of the monarchy by Jerusalem and a belt of Canaanite towns in the center of the land is more easily explained, if the two main divisions of Israel invaded Canaan from opposite

sides and failed to make connection, than if they entered the land together.

This view is strengthened by the consideration that the clan of Caleb, which Judg. 1:10 f., 20 couples with Judah, seems to have invaded Canaan from the south. In Judg. 1:13 Caleb is called the son of Kenaz, and in Josh. 14:6, 14; Num. 32:12, the Kenizzite. Josh. 15:13 suggests that the clan was of non-Israelitish origin by saying that Caleb received a portion "in the midst of the children of Judah." In Gen. 36:11, 15, 42 Kenaz appears as an Edomite family. In this case it is more likely that Caleb invaded Canaan from the south than from the east since Kadesh was on the border of Edom (Num. 20:16, E). This view is favored by the story of the spies in Num., chap. 13. In J Caleb alone is mentioned as the one sent from Kadesh to explore the south of Canaan. He encourages the people to go up (13:30), and he alone is promised an inheritance in the land (Num. 14:24; Deut. 1:36). This seems to be a reminiscence of the fact that the clan of Caleb entered Canaan from Kadesh. This view is confirmed by the fact that in Num. 13:22 (J) Caleb finds the three sons of Anak—Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmi—at Hebron when he goes to spy out the land, and the same three personages again when he conquers Hebron (Judg. 1:10, 20b = Josh. 15:14). This shows that in the thought of the original J document there was no long interval between Caleb's spying out the Hebron and his conquest of it; that is, Caleb's conquest was made from Kadesh, just as was his tour of exploration.

It appears, accordingly, that the tradition in Numbers that makes the southern tribes enter Canaan from Kadesh is

more probable than the tradition in Joshua and Judg., chap. 1, which makes them enter from the east.

This conclusion agrees with the fact that the traditions of the exodus are unable to combine the stay at Kadesh with the stay at Sinai, the reason being that the Leah tribes that were at Kadesh were never united with the Rachel tribes that were at Sinai. It agrees also with the evidence of archaeology that some Hebrews were settled in Canaan as early as the Eighteenth Dynasty while others were still in Egypt as late as the Nineteenth Dynasty.

The historical facts that underlie the traditions seem, accordingly, to be as follows. As early as 1400, under the Eighteenth Dynasty, certain Hebrew tribes entered Canaan as a part of the Habiru migration described in the Amarna Letters. These tribes were never in Egypt, but are mentioned by the Egyptian kings as settled in Canaan. Other Hebrew tribes that did not succeed in entering Canaan with the first migration settled within the borders of Egypt and were subsequently enslaved there under Rameses II of the Nineteenth Dynasty (1292-1225 B.C.). About 1200 B.C., or later, these made their escape under the leadership of Moses and subsequently entered Canaan, where they

united with the Hebrew tribes that were already settled there. A memory of this divided conquest is still preserved in Num. 14:44 f.+21:1-3, which brings the Leah tribes Judah and Simeon into Canaan from Kadesh in the south.

When under David and Solomon the tribes were united in one nation, it was supposed that their forefathers were similarly united. Tradition assumed that all the tribes went down to Egypt, that all took part in the exodus under Moses, that all were at Kadesh and all at Sinai, and that all entered Canaan at the same time under the leadership of Joshua. Consequently the writer of Judg., chap. 1, harmonized the tradition of the southern tribes with that of the northern tribes by bringing all the tribes together into the land of Moab to invade Canaan from the east. He still preserved the memory, however, that the tribes had conquered their territories independently. The next step was taken by the Judean writer in Joshua, who made the tribes conquer the land unitedly under the leadership of Joshua, but who did not represent the conquest as complete. The final step in the evolution of the tradition was taken by D in Joshua who represented the land as completely conquered by Joshua, and the Canaanites as entirely destroyed.